

REMARKS

Claims 2-13 were pending in the application. In the Office Action dated September 12, 2007, Claims 2-13 were rejected. Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 101. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite.

Applicant amended the two independent claims 2 and 8 primarily to clarify antecedent basis issues. Applicant also amended claims 8-13 to clarify that their object is a computer readable storage medium.

Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Further, the claim is a typical *in re Beauregard* claim, with computer instructions for a particular purpose stored on a computer readable storage medium. As admitted by the examiner, a computer readable storage medium is statutory subject matter. For this reason, applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of these claims is statutory, that the rejection of these claims is incorrect, and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter for which the applicant regards as his invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Further, it appears that the rejection is based on incorrect antecedent basis for some of the elements in the claims. The two independent claims were amended to correct this issue. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

It is believed that all instances of incorrect or lacking antecedent basis have been corrected. Nevertheless, the Examiner is hereby authorized, without the need of further contact by the Examiner, to enter an Examiner's Amendment to correct any case where antecedent basis is lacking.

MPEP 702.01 requires that a search be done if possible for informal (or less than fully formal) claims. The antecedent basis problems corrected in this Amendment were de minimis. They essentially comprised changing "a" to "the" for the second reference to "computer network" and "local language module" in both of the independent claims. They clearly would not have prevented an examiner reasonably skilled in the art of examining from searching the prior art for the claimed invention. Applicant therefore presumes from that and the requirement to search when possible in MPEP 702.01, that no relevant prior art was discovered

during the required search. Applicant therefore further presumes that with the failure to cite any relevant prior art, that the present claims are neither anticipated nor obvious based on the prior art. Applicant therefore respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and request that they be allowed.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment be entered. All claims should be allowable. Applicant further respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: December 10, 2007

/bruce e. hayden/

Bruce E. Hayden
Reg. No. 35,539

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
1663 Hwy 395, Suite 201
Minden, NV 89423
(775) 586-9500